



U.S. Department
of Transportation

**Federal Aviation
Administration**

Memorandum

Orlando International ATC Tower
9399 Airport Boulevard
Orlando, FL 32827

Subject: **INFORMATION:** MCO Class B Modification and
SFB Class C Ad Hoc User Meeting Comments

Date: May 22, 2003

From: Air Traffic Manager, Orlando International ATCT

Reply to
Attn of:

To: Manager, Airspace Branch, ASO-520
Attn: Walt Cochran

MCO and SFB ATCT'S held three user meetings to discuss the proposed Class C at SFB airport and the proposed Class B modifications. One meeting was at SFB, one at ISM and one at ORL. Listed below are the comments received at those meetings and the responses from MCO and SFB ATCT's.

The SFB Class B/C user meeting was held on January 14, 2003, at SFB airport with about 20 users present. Users requested the following modifications to the proposed SFB Class C.

Reduce the Class C 10-mile ring north of SFB to align with the current Class B. This gives more distance between DAB Class C and SFB Class C allowing more time for aircraft to contact the appropriate facility. Without this adjustment the SFB Class C would have encroached into DAB airspace. Comair Academy (now Delta Connection Academy) (DCA) stated this change was needed to accommodate current practice areas. This change will also allow users to climb sooner and avoid obstructions in the area north of SFB.

MCO RESPONSE: Since SFB is primarily an east/west operation this adjustment can be made without affecting safety in the area. Change the proposed SFB Class C to align with the current Class B northern boundary. (See attached chart).

Users from Cedar Knoll (01FL) requested a cutout of the Class C to operate the airport. Cedar Knoll is a north south operation 4 miles east of SFB. The ILS to runway 27R, NDB C and RNAV 27R glide path crosses 01FL at approximately 1200'. The cutout would be just west of the runway to .5 NM either end of the runway then circle to the east to the edge of the five mile ring below 700'.

MCO RESPONSE: The proposed Class C airspace was modified to show the 01FL cutout as requested.

DCA and other users would like to have VFR departures stay with the ATCT and terminate at the five-mile ring below the outer area. This would be accomplished with a letter of agreement between the SFB flight schools and FAA defining route and altitude to the edge of the surface area.

MCO RESPONSE: Develop a letter of agreement with SFB users and establish the procedures so users can stay with SFB ATCT as requested.

The ISM user meeting was held on February 25, 2003, with about five users present. No comments were received at this meeting.

Later that same day, the regular ISM airport user meeting was held. MCO representatives attended that meeting also and briefed the users on the Class C /B proposals. Again no comments were received. ISM users were advised to contact MCO if another meeting to discuss the proposals was needed. As of this date, no request has been received.

The ORL Class B/C user meeting was held on March 7, 2003, at ORL airport with more than 40 users in attendance.

The ORL users had concerns about the impact of a SFB Class C on the ORL airport. ORL is located between MCO Class B and the proposed SFB Class C airspace. Users thought the proposed airspace changes would make it difficult for aircraft to arrive and depart ORL without receiving a clearance from ATC. The majority of those speaking up at this meeting were in favor one of the following three options to reduce that impact.

ORL VFR departures get a transponder code on the ground. User comments: This would ensure ORL departures receive radar service and a possible clearance through the SFB Class C.

MCO Response: This is separate from the SFB Class C airspace issue. MCO management is setting up an ad-hoc team to discuss ORL VFR codes on the ground.

Establishment of an uncontrolled VFR flyway over the top of SFB at 2500' and a new flyway east of the proposed SFB Class C. GOAA submitted drawings of these flyways (attached).

MCO Response: The following problems were noted with the flyway over the top of SFB.

- SFB departures would be restricted to 2,000' until clear of the flyway over SFB at 2500', creating conflicts and additional noise.
- The airspace over SFB between 2000' and 3000' is used to transition arrivals and departures to/from ORL airport.
- An aircraft entering this flyway from the south must first have a Class B clearance.
- Aircraft entering this flyway from the north would have no way to exit the flyway south of SFB without first obtaining a Class B or C clearance.
- Due to the complexity of the airspace in the SFB area, a VFR flyway through the proposed Class C is not advisable without having an adverse impact on SFB operations.

Different altitudes that might work for the flyway were discussed, none could be found. The team also looked at moving the flyway east or west of SFB. Doing either would impact SFB arrivals and departures, making it impractical.

The Greater Orlando Aviation Authority (GOAA) proposed VFR flyway east of SFB below 3,000' outside the proposed Class C would work fine and will be published.

Note: At the present, aircraft must have an ATC clearance to fly over SFB between 10,000' to 1,600' due to the current Class B airspace. With the proposed Class C airspace only two-way radio communication would be required to fly over SFB below 3,000'.

Changing ORL airspace from a Class D to a Class C airspace. ORL worked 86,000 instrument operations in year 2002; 75,000 operations are the minimum required for a Class C airspace. An ORL Class C would ensure all ORL departures receive a Class C clearance. Drawings were presented by GOAA showing the proposed ORL Class C airspace. ORL Air Traffic Manager (ATM) and GOAA are looking into this proposal. Users at ORL have indicated they are going to have a discussion to determine if the group wants to request the ORL Class C or not. They will advise MCO of the results of that meeting.

MCO Response: Whether or not ORL is Class C does not change the need and design of SFB Class C airspace.

Additional verbal comments during the ORL meeting were also made in the following areas.

Comment: SFB enplanements are decreasing. What is the traffic trend? It should be looked at and a forecast made to see if the need for a Class C would be there in the future.

Response: SFB 2002 enplanements are 622,000; this shows a consistent rate of enplanements. International flights are forecast to increase for 2003.

Comment: Raise the floor of the proposed SFB Class C to 1600' within the 5-10 mile circle so VFR's could fly under it @ 1500'.

Response: The crossing altitude at the final approach fixes are 1500' and 1600', raising the shelf would create the very conflict that the C airspace is designed to eliminate. Standard Class C configuration is 1200' above the ground, which puts this area at 1300'.

Comment: Could a VFR aircraft fly at 1200' under the proposed Class C shelf and be legal with ground/obstruction clearance?

Response: According to FAR 91.119 Minimum Safe Altitude, yes.

Comment: MCO sectors already seem very busy and pilots have a difficult time getting onto the frequency to request a Class B clearance or VFR traffic advisories. How will MCO handle the additional workload created with a Class C at SFB? Will MCO get additional radarscopes and controllers to work them?

Response: MCO and SFB management committed to the users that changes would be made to ensure service is provided. Additionally, procedures and airspace resectorization have been designed by the Class C team to accomplish this task.

Comment: By realigning the eastern edge of the proposed Class C to follow the eastern shore of Lake Harney would make it easier for pilots to identify the boundary.

Response: This proposal would create a non standard Class C and be more restrictive than a 10 mile circle. An aircraft following the eastern shore of Lake Harney will remain clear of the proposed Class C. The 10mile circle should stay as is.

ORL users were asked to fill out written comments during the meeting, 11 written comments were received. Each comment area is listed below along with the number of persons expressing the same idea.

Comment: Not in favor of Class C at SFB. (1)

Response: To provide safe airspace in the SFB area the Class C is required.

Comment: ORL must have VFR codes on the ground for SFB Class C to work. (7)

Response: This is separate from the SFB Class C airspace issue. MCO management is establishing an ad-hoc team to discuss VFR codes on the ground at ORL.

Comment: Create a VFR corridor over SFB airport through SFB Class C. (8)

Response: See number ORL #2 above.

Comment: Use Ground lighting aids to identify flyways. (1)

Response: Not practical.

Comment: MCO TRACON needs more frequencies available for pilots to receive service today and with Class C even more would be needed. (3)

Response: MCO and SFB management assured the users that changes would be made to ensure service is provided. Additionally, procedures and airspace resectorization have been designed by the Class C team to accomplish this task.

Comment: Are pilot complaints and NMAC's really valid? (British pilots are not use to this much traffic). 1

Response: Pilot and controller reports of conflicts in the SFB area are still up.

Comment: Establish ORL Class C. (3)

Response: See number ORL #3 above.

Comment: Looks OK to me. (1)

Response: No comment required.

Traffic continues to grow in the SFB area and conflicts continue to be a problem. For the safe and expeditious flow of traffic in the area, MCO requests ASO-520 approve this proposed airspace and proceed with the next step in the implementation process as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please call Support Specialist, Bruce Knobbs at 407-852-7514.

Originally signed by

Donna Gropper
Air Traffic Manager

Attachments
MCO/SFB proposed airspace.
ORL/GOAA proposal for airspace changes.